

Choices in common, Communities in common: Canadians deliberate about globalization

Final Report September 1999

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

What is public deliberation?

I. Introduction

1. Objectives
2. Methodology

II. What Canadians Said About Globalization

1. Community Forums
 - a) Concerns and Hopes
 - b) Shifting Opinions, Core Values
2. Youth Forum Echoes Concerns
3. Where Do We Go From Here?

III. Deliberation as a Tool for Public Engagement

1. Strengths of Deliberation
2. Weaknesses of Deliberation
3. Outstanding Issues
4. Conditions for Success
5. Next Steps

Appendix: Pre- and Post-Forum Questionnaire Results

Other Publications on Public Deliberation

Acknowledgements

The Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC) is a coalition of over 100 Canadian non-profit organizations who seek to change the course of human development in ways that favour social and economic equity, democratic participation, environmental integrity and respect for human rights. The *in common* campaign of CCIC members aims to make action against poverty a public and political priority.

The executive summary on the deliberation pilot project report is also posted on CCIC's website. Other publications related to deliberation are also available from CCIC and are posted on CCIC's website.

Funding for this project was provided by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Project Coordinator: Jacquie Dale, CCIC

Researcher/Writer: Ann Simpson, CCIC

Administrative Assistant: Linda Brassard, CCIC

Cape Breton Coordinator: Ruth Schneider, Centre for International Studies

Winnipeg Coordinator: Marilee Geller, Manitoba Council for International Co-

operation (MCIC) Brandon (Manitoba) Coordinator: Curt Shoultz, Marquis Project

Montréal Coordinator: Luc Leblanc, Association québécoise pour la coopération internationale (AQOCI)

October 1999

What is public deliberation?

To put the findings of the deliberation pilot project into context, it is necessary to understand how deliberation differs from conventional methods of engaging the public in decision-making.

Public deliberation involves bringing together people from a variety of backgrounds and viewpoints to work through different approaches to solving a problem. These approaches are generally outlined in a participants' guide that presents the pros and cons of each approach in a balanced way. The choices are not mutually exclusive, but each approaches the issue from a different perspective based on different core values.

In a typical forum of three hours, a group of anywhere from five to 20 people deliberates the different approaches with the assistance of a trained moderator. The emphasis is on mutual respect, sharing of views and building on the views of others, rather than on debate or attack. A "recorder" observes the deliberation and listens for points of agreement. At the end of the deliberation, the recorder reviews the findings from the deliberation with the group to see if there is anything that everyone can agree upon—any common ground that can form the basis for future action on the issue.

People do not need to be experts to participate in a deliberation, because deliberation is ultimately about values. The participants' guide provides background information, and with the assistance of skilled moderators, people can rapidly make the connections between an issue such as globalization and their own experiences. Unlike the polarized debates that dominate public discussion on many issues, deliberation provides a chance to explore approaches, test ideas, and consider grey areas. It can help people break out of habitual viewpoints and consider new options. It also provides a format in which people can begin to make connections between local and global issues.

In a successful deliberation, people must face up to the contradictions and long-term consequences of their opinions, and make choices. By working through the conflicts and trade-offs associated with an issue, people clarify what is most important to them, improve their understanding of the issue, and may find common ground from which alternatives can develop. Any common ground that does emerge represents a more considered public judgment than the top-of-mind opinions collected through surveys and polls.

I. Introduction

From March to June, 1999, public deliberations on globalization were held in Cape Breton, Manitoba and parts of Québec. These deliberations were part of a pilot project coordinated by the Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC) as part of the *in common* campaign against global poverty. Funding for the project was provided by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

The regional deliberations were organized by the Centre for International Studies (CIS) in Cape Breton, by the Manitoba Council for International Co-operation (MCIC) in Winnipeg, by The Marquis Project in Brandon, and by l'Association québécoise des organismes de coopération internationale (AQOCI) in Montréal. CCIC also organized a three-day National Youth Forum in Ottawa.

1. Objectives

CCIC had a number of objectives for this pilot project. These included demonstrating the deliberation process as a means of engaging the public in considering international issues, and building capacity among member organizations to run deliberations. An important objective was to reach out beyond traditional international development networks to involve Canadians who had not previously been involved with international issues.

Beyond these "process" objectives, the project aimed to provide input from citizens to decision-makers on an important policy issue. Globalization is transforming Canada and the world, and Canadians want more input into trade and economic decisions. The deliberations provided people from all walks of life – many of whom had not been previously involved with

international issues - with an opportunity to consider the pros and cons of various approaches to globalization, and to try to find common ground on how Canada should proceed.

The pilot project was very successful, and a number of the organizations that were involved in it will be continuing to experiment with ways to use deliberation in public engagement, particularly for difficult, polarized issues.

in common

The 100+ members of CCIC have joined together in the in common campaign to make action against poverty a public and political priority. One item on the 10-point agenda of this campaign is "Creating new opportunities for citizen participation," because poverty cannot be eliminated without citizen involvement. The deliberation pilot project was undertaken as part of the in common effort to engage Canadians as global citizens.

2. Methodology

Issue Framing

An important part of deliberation is "framing" the issue. This involves developing approaches or choices that reflect the way people talk about and view an issue in their daily lives. This is often quite different from the way experts view and talk about the issue.

CCIC and its regional partners went through an extensive process to frame the issue of globalization and develop a participants' guide. The process began with a literature review and research and interviews with more than 20 people from many walks of life—experts and non-experts. The draft framework developed was then tested in English and French focus groups and reworked based on the feedback received.

A draft issue guide was developed and reviewed by the project team (national and regional) as well as representatives of Canadian Policy Research Networks, the Alliance of Manufacturers & Exporters Canada and the Business Council for National Issues. The guide was also pre-tested in test deliberation forums in Sydney, Winnipeg and Montréal. In general, the feedback indicated that the choices were clear and balanced, and that the guide provided a good framework for a deliberation.

The final deliberation guide included three options or choices for Canada's response to globalization. The first choice, "Strengthen local communities," had a local focus. It emphasized the need to protect Canada's quality of life and buffer ourselves from the effects of globalization through actions like buying locally and strengthening social programs. The second choice, "Compete globally," argued that Canadians can only maintain their standard of living by competing on global markets, and that this requires better skill development, lower taxes, less debt and less expensive social programs. The third choice, "Build a fairer global economy" was

based on the premise that in a globalized world, we have to help others to help ourselves, and that new rules are needed to ensure that the benefits of globalization are distributed more fairly and the negative effects are minimized.

Community Deliberations

Regional partners organized their deliberations in different ways. Most put together multisectoral planning groups—including domestic organizations and others with whom they had not traditionally worked—to advise them on strategy and to provide contacts. All regional organizers made extensive contacts and promoted the deliberations through the media. Moderators for the deliberation sessions attended a two-day training session provided by CCIC and followed a consistent methodology in implementing the sessions.

In Cape Breton and Brandon, organizers made a special effort to organize deliberations in rural areas. In Winnipeg, MCIC experimented with a number of variations on the deliberation process, including a three-session "study circle" that enabled participants to spend more time considering each of the choices. Winnipeg and Brandon also attempted a video conference deliberation between groups in the two cities. In Québec, AQOCI worked with multisectoral organizations such as community economic development corporations (CDECs) and community service committees (CLSCs); these organizations acted as hosts for the deliberations and invited participants.

In all, 33 deliberations were held in the three regions. Organizers made a particular effort to reach out to youth, business people, members of minority ethnic communities and others who have not traditionally been involved in international development. In Winnipeg and Montréal, regional coordinators organized special youth forums, while in Cape Breton and Brandon, organizers focused on encouraging youth to attend the community forums.

A total of 460 people participated in a deliberation (including people who participated in deliberations as part of the moderator training). Of these people, 340 completed pre- and post-forum questionnaires that collected data on participant characteristics as well as views on globalization. Most of the questions on the pre-forum and post-forum questionnaires were identical, in order to track changes in participants' views that resulted from the deliberation.

Overall, women accounted for 51 percent of participants. More than a quarter (27 percent) of the participants worked in the private sector, and more than a third (36 percent) indicated that they had no previous experience with international issues. Since the pre-forum questionnaire question about involvement with international issues was very broadly worded, it is likely that an even higher percentage of participants had no previous involvement with international development. Nearly a quarter (24 percent) of the participants in the deliberations were youth (28 and under).

Follow-up interviews were carried out with a sample of participants three months after the deliberations in order to assess the extent to which the deliberations had influenced their thinking or behaviour in the longer term.

National Youth Forum

In May, CCIC organized a three-day National Youth Forum to build on the work of the community deliberations. A diverse group of 31 young people (16 to 28 years old) participated in the forum. Many had previously participated in one of the community deliberations.

The youth considered the common ground that had been found in the community deliberations and then deliberated a new series of choices that were more specifically related to globalization and the future of work. They presented their findings and questions to a panel of four decision-makers on Parliament Hill (Senators Landon Pearson and Peggy Butts, and MPs Keith Martin and Stéphan Tremblay). On the final day, a panel of youth presented their concerns and findings to the Annual General Meeting (AGM) of CCIC.

II. What Canadians Said About Globalization

These findings were drawn from the common ground reported by moderators of the various deliberations, from observations of CCIC staff, and from participant responses to pre- and post-forum questionnaires. They represent the common threads that emerged in all regions.

Participants were not a random sample, so the quantitative data should not be interpreted like polling data. Participants self-selected to attend the deliberations, and not all participants completed the questionnaires. Given the process of deliberation and reflection that people went through, the post-forum questionnaire results represent a more considered opinion than might be obtained from a one-time poll. Taken together with reports from trained moderators and observers, the questionnaire data provide an indication of the concerns and opinions of a somewhat diverse group of Canadians in three regions of the country.

1. Community Forums

a) Concerns and Hopes

Participants were concerned about the current course of globalization and wanted change.

Participants in the deliberations recognized that globalization is having a major impact on Canadians and on people around the world. Although they recognized the benefits of globalization, they expressed concerns about the directions it is taking.

In questionnaires, participants registered the greatest concern about the statement that *"Wealth and power are being concentrated in fewer hands: the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer."* In post-forum questionnaires, 83 percent of respondents were "very" concerned about this, and 14 percent were "somewhat" concerned. There was also strong concern that

"multinational chain stores are driving local small stores out of business": 65 percent of post-forum respondents were "very" and 32 percent "somewhat" concerned by this statement.

Participants demonstrated considerable pragmatism in their assessment of the impacts of globalization. There was obviously deep concern about some aspects, but many were also willing to acknowledge the benefits (or potential benefits) of globalization. One group in Brandon noted that globalization was responsible for at least a thousand jobs in their region. A group in Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia, agreed that *"multinationals are here to stay, and help this community."*⁽¹⁾

A participant in Sydney noted that globalization is *"great, let's make it work for us"* but most people had a more nuanced view. According to one Sydney participant, *"I realize that globalization is 'a necessary evil' which we may turn into a positive outcome if we keep in mind the issue of justice and the dignity of humankind ... Globalization does have some positive aspects that were exposed here tonight."*

Although people recognized that globalization is well underway, and has the potential to bring benefits, they noted that the current course of globalization seems to be neglecting the human element, prioritizing the economic at the expense of the social. Participants in the Winnipeg study circle noted that *"Wealth is more than money. Wealth includes human rights, the environment, social programs, etc."*

There was a strong sense that change is needed—that Canadians should not "sleepwalk" through the process of globalization, but should work to ensure that the way it proceeds reflects Canadians' values. One group in Brandon noted that *"we are at a crossroads. Now is the time to look at how to work towards solutions for issues related to globalization.. It is time to use our creativity to face these issues."* A participant at a Montréal youth forum noted that globalization is *"a huge machine that we must tame, regulate and mould to our ideals."*

Deliberation groups in all areas expressed the belief that individuals have a responsibility in their daily lives and decisions to put their values into action—to purchase ethically, to conserve resources and energy, to educate their children about global issues. Although people in some groups, particularly in Cape Breton, occasionally expressed a sense of powerlessness or hopelessness, most participants believed people could act to put their values into action. In fact, according to moderators, even some of the more discouraged people gained a sense of hope through discussion with others.

"The globalization cat is out of the bag. The question is: how do we tame it?"

Comment from a participant in Baddeck, Nova Scotia

"I think that, despite the many barriers, it is possible to achieve globalization that is fair and good for the environment."

Comment from a youth forum participant in Montréal

"Globalization is a reality we are not going to reverse (like gravity). The issue is how we manage it."

A participant in Winnipeg

"Unregulated globalization could become a corporate feeding frenzy. It could also enrich our lives and the lives of others."

A participant in Brandon

There was great support for the importance of strengthening local communities, but not for isolationism.

Participants were very forceful on the importance of strengthening communities, economically, socially and culturally, but were equally clear that they did not want to cut their communities off from the world or "go back to the past." This came out very strongly in the common ground from the deliberation groups, and in the questionnaires.

Of a list of three principles that could guide Canada's response to globalization, respondents agreed most strongly with the statement that *"we should focus on strengthening our local communities."* In all, 73 percent of post-forum questionnaire respondents "strongly agreed" with this statement, while 23 percent "somewhat agreed."

Not surprisingly, support for the statement was highest in rural areas and small towns: 85 percent strongly agreed and 15 percent somewhat agreed, for 100 percent agreement.

Strengthening communities was seen as a first step in reaching out to the world. Strong communities were seen as a prerequisite for international fairness—a number of groups alluded to how taking action at a local level helps empower people to then look more broadly and engage at an international level. As study circle participants in Manitoba noted, *"Communities need to be linked, not isolated. Community is the key to ... looking at international issues."* Another group in Winnipeg spoke of *"building bridges not barriers"*. Groups in Québec spoke frequently of "solidarity" within and between communities, building towards international cooperation. One group's common ground referred to the need for a *"globalization of solidarity."*

People did not want to focus on their communities in a protectionist way, however—as a group in Brandon noted, *"protective policies can boomerang on protective communities."* Or, as another Brandon group noted, *"giving up efficiency to subsidize industries and protect ways of life is a slippery slope."*

Although participants were clear that community relationships and the human element were important, they were also clear that communities need an economic base. As participants in Mather, Manitoba noted, *"this is a great place, but people need work to stay."* A group in Sydney agreed, noting that *"we can't exist only by selling to ourselves."* Several groups came up with specific suggestions regarding how to strengthen their communities economically and socially.

The importance of supporting local businesses was mentioned frequently. When pushed to consider the consequences of their views in the post-forum questionnaire, however, people showed more ambivalence. Only 18 percent strongly agreed that *"we should focus on buying local products even if this means we will have less variety in our food, music, etc. and less exposure to other cultures"*, while 39 percent agreed somewhat with the statement. These figures were higher than pre-forum, where only 12 percent strongly agreed and 33 percent somewhat agreed. Young people (28 and under) were less likely to agree with the statement, but showed a greater increase in agreement after the forum.⁽²⁾ When asked whether *"we should buy Canadian-made products even if they cost more than imports,"* 28 percent of post-forum respondents strongly agreed and 52 percent somewhat agreed.

Groups in Cape Breton and Manitoba frequently showed skepticism regarding government community development programs, emphasizing the importance of communities doing things for themselves, from the ground up. While groups in Québec agreed on the importance of community development by the community, they were more likely in their common ground to also mention the importance of government's role, for example in terms of maintaining social programs and environmental standards.

"Strengthen communities, but don't close ourselves off to the world. We must keep an openness, a view to the outside world."
A deliberation group in Montréal

Many participants supported the value of competition in stimulating innovation and excellence, but expressed concerns that the current playing field is not level.

Not everyone agreed with the benefits of competition, but most were concerned that as companies grow ever larger, there is less and less true competition.

Manitobans were particularly likely to see the good points of competition. As one group in Brandon noted, *"being competitive and innovative is not necessarily incompatible with being conscientious and accountable."* But another group in Brandon noted, *"competition is a two-edged sword: it has the potential to make people more innovative, or it has the potential to make the rich richer."* A group in Winnipeg noted that *"competition is not bad—but must be monitored."* The Winnipeg study circle participants noted that *"Competition at its basic level is good—[it] stimulates creativity, provides choices, leads to advances in technology/medicine. But...it can become like a cancer if not regulated."*

A group in Baddeck, Cape Breton noted the *"need to have competition always present,"* but also noted that *"free competition is not free at all — it's heavily controlled by multinational corporations."* Participants in a Montréal deliberation agreed that *"being competitive is positive but it must be defined with regulations (e.g., environmental)."* Not everyone agreed on the benefits of competition, however; a group in Cape North, Cape Breton agreed that *"we need more cooperation, not competition."*

Although most participants appreciated the benefits of true competition, the deliberation groups generally did not respond positively to the second choice in the deliberation guide—"Compete

globally." Most groups saw this choice as favouring a small number of people at the expense of the majority. Yet in post-forum questionnaires, 16 percent strongly agreed and 31 percent somewhat agreed that *"we should concentrate on increasing exports and being the best traders we can be."* Women were less likely than men to agree with this statement.⁽³⁾ As discussed later in this report, there was also considerable volatility of opinion on this statement (i.e., people on both sides of the question changed their minds).

"We here in our area do have to be efficient and productive to survive. However, locally as well as globally, there is more to working than making money."

A deliberation participant in Sydney

"Unless we compete globally, we will face a major reduction in our standard of living. Politically, I don't think Canadians are willing to reduce their standard of living."

A participant in Winnipeg

"Large corporations are anti-competition. For things to work, there must be healthy competition."

Youth forum participant in Montréal

Participants expressed a strong desire for more education about globalization and its impacts, and for better consumer information. There was considerable hope that young people would challenge negative aspects of globalization.

The importance of education about globalization—both public education and formal education—was mentioned by nearly all the groups. A young participant in Sydney noted that *"a lot of this information isn't well known and should be,"* and a Sydney group suggested that economics, globalization and Cape Breton's place in the global economy should be studied early in high school. As one student noted, *"there needs to be a raised awareness among the youth of Canada. We cannot fix something we do not know exists or do not understand."*

A participant in Baddeck noted that *"most communities are not conscious that globalization is happening. If we want to motivate people to make choices and changes, we have to educate them so they know what's going on."* One person in Québec spoke of the importance of doing "unpopular education" as opposed to popular education, as she felt that people often don't want to know if products they are purchasing were made in poor working conditions, because they enjoy their comfortable consumerism.

Many people expressed a desire for clear information about the conditions under which products are made, so they can use their "consumer power" in accordance with their values. As a person in Brandon noted, *"sometimes I make a wrong decision as a consumer because I don't know any better."* A number of groups noted that it would be useful to have some kind of labelling or other information that would indicate the working conditions and environmental conditions under which products were made. A young participant in Mabou, Cape Breton expressed interest in

developing a pamphlet *"so that Canadian consumers can make more informed decisions on their purchases."* And a young woman in Montréal spoke of the importance of being a *"consommacteur"*, not just a passive consumer.

People do not accept that government is "powerless" to act in the face of globalization.

Canadians expect their governments to uphold existing standards, such as environmental standards, and not let corporations dictate public policy. One group in Winnipeg stated that we should *"stop being so passive as a nation."*

Several groups noted that Canada could play a role in improving globalization—either a facilitating role in getting parties to the table, or a role as a mentor and leader. In post-forum questionnaire responses, there was strong agreement with the statement that *"We should show international leadership, like we did with the campaign to ban land mines, to make sure that everyone has a fair chance to benefit from globalization"* (72 percent strongly agreed, 21 percent somewhat agreed.)

There was a common view that government is not listening to the people, and that more citizen participation is needed.

People responded positively to the deliberations and took seriously their role as citizens. As a participant in a Montréal youth forum noted, *"I saw {the deliberation} as being part of my duty as a citizen."* Participants were clear that they wanted input into government decisions, but were concerned about whether their involvement was worth the effort—whether their voices were being heard. Cape Bretoners were particularly likely to note that governments are not listening to the people, but this concern was also expressed by a number of participants in different regions.

Most participants were interested in what was going to be done with the results of the deliberations; Quebecers were particularly concerned that the results be forwarded to decision-makers and acted upon. As one group in Québec noted in their common ground, *"action, not just words!"*

"Seems to me big business dictates to government. We do not have representation by population anymore in Canada!"

A participant in Deloraine, Manitoba

Participants saw a need for broader accountability on the part of corporations, as well as governments and individuals.

The importance of putting our values into practice—as individuals, corporations and governments—was a theme that recurred in many deliberations. In its common ground, the deliberation group in Deloraine, Manitoba noted that *"corporations need to be more moral."*

Many stressed that citizens and governments must increase their expectations of corporations—that the accountability of corporations should extend beyond return to shareholders. There was a lot of concern in the deliberations about working conditions in developing countries, and about whether Canadians were contributing to poor conditions through their consumer purchases. There was very strong agreement with the statement that *"Canadian companies operating in other countries should uphold international labour and environmental standards even if their competitors don't"* (76 percent of post-forum questionnaire respondents strongly agreed, 18 percent somewhat agreed).

When it came to considering the personal tradeoffs that would result, people showed a bit less support for improving working conditions in developing countries, although the support was still strong. Sixty-nine percent of post-forum questionnaire respondents strongly agreed that *"we should push for better working conditions in developing countries, even if this means that imported products will be more expensive."* Another 27 percent somewhat agreed.

There was considerable disagreement with the statement that *"we should trade with countries that want our business even if we don't like their views on human rights"*: 43 percent of post-forum questionnaire respondents strongly disagreed and 23 percent somewhat disagreed with this statement. People with no international development experience were less likely to disagree with the statement.⁽⁴⁾ Women and young people were more likely to strongly disagree.⁽⁵⁾

"The way we spend our money is almost like a vote."

A deliberation participant in Mabou, Nova Scotia

"We are now part of the problem. What would we have to understand and to give up in order to be part of the solution?"

A deliberation group in Cape North, Nova Scotia

"I support free trade, but I do not believe that that by itself will have us living happily ever after."

A participant in Winnipeg

There was considerable concern about the environment and the impacts of the current pattern of globalization on prospects for sustainable development.

People were concerned that environmental regulations were being weakened in Canada and ignored elsewhere by powerful corporations.

Participants in Cape Breton cited the collapse of the fisheries as an example of the pitfalls of ignoring the environment. A deliberation group in Brandon noted that *"ecological collapse is not cost-effective,"* while another noted that *"good commercial arrangements are sustainable ones."* A participant at a Montréal youth forum summed up the views of many when he stated that *"environmental regulations should be strict and universally applied."* A group in Winnipeg noted that *"social and environmental accounting are as important as economic accounting."*

There was support for the idea of a "fairer" global economy. But there was also confusion and skepticism about how a fairer system could be brought about.

As noted previously, questionnaire respondents strongly supported the idea that Canada should show international leadership to make sure that everyone has a fair chance to benefit from globalization. In their common ground, a number of groups expressed support for the third choice in the deliberation guide—"Build a fairer global economy." At the same time, they tempered this with comments like *"it's the impossible dream."*

People had difficulty in envisioning the "fairer" global economy—many had a hard time seeing how the great imbalances in wealth and power could be righted. The deliberation group in Mather, Manitoba noted that a fair global economy was *"a fine ideal,"* but that there were many political, social, financial and technological obstacles, and *"fairness and globalization are in opposition."* As they put it, a *"level playing field is impossible, the powerful make and break rules all the time."*

As participants in the Winnipeg study circle noted, *"We want the 'fairness'... but the mechanism for making it happen is missing right now."* They suggested that another forum be held to figure out how to put international rules/regulations in place. Naturally, groups that were more heavily weighted towards those with experience in international development issues had less difficulty in envisioning measures to increase fairness, and were supportive of the idea of international mechanisms to protect labour, social and environmental rights. The importance of debt forgiveness was mentioned by a number of groups.

A number of groups questioned who would determine what is "fair." A group in Brandon noted, *"how can we create incentives for fairness in this competitive world?"* A group in Winnipeg noted that *"we value equity, environmental protection, protection for social programs and fairness—although fairness is difficult to define."* Another noted that *"companies need to be more accountable and controls may need to be set, but who will set and monitor the controls?"*

"If multinationals are more powerful than governments, maybe we should all buy a few shares and go to those meetings."

A deliberation participant in Baddeck, Cape Breton

"The current driving force is economic growth for profit. Other driving forces—NGOs working for a more diverse, equitable and sustainable world, community groups building fairer, more environmentally friendly communities, and individual efforts to change their consumption patterns—can also become balancing and driving forces, but it will take time, effort and commitment."

A participant in the Winnipeg study circle

"We must have more humane values, and never put them aside, if things are ultimately to change."

A participant at a Montréal youth forum

On the other hand, a participant in Baddeck summed up the views of many when he noted that a fairer global economy, despite its difficulties, *"is probably the only choice we have."*

b) Shifting Opinions, Core Values

In comments and questionnaire responses, participants revealed that the open exchanges of the deliberations had caused them to question their views and advance their thinking. And although they did not always change their minds, they had a better understanding and appreciation of opposing viewpoints. (A summary of the quantitative questionnaire responses is provided in the Appendix.)

Overall, 96 percent of participants who completed questionnaires changed their responses on at least one question on the post-forum questionnaire, as compared with the pre-forum questionnaire. Young people, people without higher education and people who indicated they had no previous experience with international issues were more likely to shift their opinions.

In the analysis of the questionnaire results, both total opinion shift and net opinion shift were calculated for each question.

- *Total* opinion shift represents the aggregate of shifts *in both directions*—towards greater agreement and towards greater disagreement, and is an indication of the overall extent to which people on different sides of an issue were questioning and rethinking their views.
- *Net* opinion shift represents the amount by *which the group as a whole shifted its opinion on a question*, either towards greater agreement or greater disagreement.

Both types of shift are interesting from a policy perspective. A high amount of total shift indicates that opinions are not firm on either side of an issue. Net shifts are significant because people have deliberated an issue for several hours, challenging their own views as well as those

of others. If a net shift occurs, it probably represents a more solid opinion change than the type of fluctuation of opinion that might be picked up by polls. A high amount of net shift on an issue suggests that information provision and deliberation could contribute to an overall change in public opinion on the issue.

In questionnaire responses, participants showed the greatest amount of opinion shift on the following questions.

Question 1: Concerns about Globalization

Question 1 tested levels of concern about various statements on perceived impacts of globalization.

The greatest total shift in opinion was seen for the statement that "*High taxes are making Canadian companies less competitive in the world economy.*" Of all the statements in question 1, people showed the least concern about this one (18 percent were strongly concerned pre-forum and 43 percent somewhat concerned.) But responses to this statement showed the greatest amount of opinion movement—during the forums, 37 percent of respondents changed their opinion in one way or the other. This suggests that people's views on the issue were less firm than on some other issues, and many people re-evaluated their opinions as a result of the deliberations.

This statement also showed the greatest net change in opinion: a 3 percent shift towards less concern about the statement.

The least total shift occurred for the statement that "*Wealth and power are being concentrated in fewer hands: the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.*" Concern was high for this statement (84 percent pre-forum were very concerned, 13 percent somewhat concerned) and only 11 percent of respondents changed their opinion.

This statement also showed the least net shift. The firmness of opinion and the extent of concern about this statement suggest deep-seated values of fairness and equality.

What values were common in the deliberations?

The value of fairness and equality emerged in many ways in the deliberations and questionnaire responses. There was great concern about the unfair aspects of globalization—about the inequality in the distribution of costs and benefits.

Other common values were democracy and citizen participation. The value of community and human relationships was also reiterated, reflecting concerns that the current course of globalization is neglecting the human element.

Strong values around accountability also emerged, with participants being clear that corporations, governments, civil society and individuals must take responsibility for the impacts of their actions. It was also clear that people valued the natural

environment.

Finally, the value of pragmatism was very evident. People didn't always like the changes that globalization brings to their communities, but they recognized the need for an economic base. They were attracted to the vision of a fairer world economy, but had a keen sense of how wealth and power influence outcomes, and therefore wanted a clearer vision of how progress towards fairness could be made.

Question 2: Responses to Globalization

Question 2 tested agreement or disagreement with three statements about how Canada should respond to globalization.

The greatest total shift of opinion was seen for the statement that "*We should concentrate on increasing exports and being the best traders we can be.*" In all, 48 percent of respondents changed their views on this during the forum. The net change in opinion was much less, indicating that people on both sides of the issues changed their minds. This suggests that opinions on this issue are volatile.

The least total shift occurred for the statement that "*We should show international leadership, like we did with the campaign to ban land mines, to make sure that everyone has a fair chance to benefit from globalization.*" Some 25 percent of respondents changed their view in one direction or another. Post-forum agreement with the statement was strong (93 percent).

This statement showed the greatest net change: a 6 percent shift towards greater agreement with the statement. The relatively small total change suggests firmly held views, pointing again to the value that Canadians place on fairness and on Canada's role internationally. The net increase in agreement suggests that deliberation and exposure to more information and perspectives further solidify agreement.

The least net shift occurred for the statement that "*We should focus on strengthening our communities.*" Agreement with this statement was strong coming into the forum (77 percent strongly agreed, 19 percent somewhat agreed) and there was little change. The lack of opinion change after deliberation suggests deeply held values.

Question 3: Weighing Tradeoffs

Question 3 measured agreement or disagreement with various statements that attempted to bring out some of the tradeoffs inherent in different courses of action. For

trade-off statements that related to topics that were extensively considered in the majority of the community forums (e.g., the pros and cons of "buying local"), there was considerable net shift in

opinion, suggesting the potential impact that intense deliberation has on people's views of tradeoffs.

The greatest amount of total opinion shift was seen for the statement that *"Corporate taxes in Canada should be reduced to attract investment and help Canadian companies compete globally, even if this means that there will be fewer revenues to support social programs."* The net shift was low – a one percent shift towards greater overall agreement. This indicates that people on both sides of the question changed their minds, which is in keeping with the high amount of opinion change for the statement in Question 1 that related to taxes and corporate competitiveness.

The greatest net change was seen for the statement that *"We should focus on buying local products even if this means we will have less variety in our food, music etc. and less exposure to other cultures"*: a shift of 12 percent towards greater agreement. The intense discussions that many groups had about community evidently had an impact on people's views of the value of supporting local producers.

The statement that *"Canadian companies operating in other countries should uphold international labour and environmental standards even if their competitors don't"* **showed the least amount of total opinion change:** 26 percent of respondents changed their opinion on this.

This statement also showed low net shift (a 1 percent shift towards greater agreement), suggesting deeply held values. This reinforces the message that many groups provided in their common ground, that Canadians expect corporations to be socially and environmentally responsible, both in Canada and in their operations abroad.

It is interesting to note that, in all three types of questions, opinions were most volatile around issues related to the role of corporations in the economy (e.g., corporate taxes and export competitiveness).

2. Youth Forum Echoes Concerns

As the 31 participants in the National Youth Forum had all participated in the standard three-hour forum on globalization, they used a different deliberation guide than had been used in the community forums. They also spent much longer (nearly three days as opposed to three hours) considering and deliberating issues of globalization and work. Nevertheless, many of their concerns were similar to those which surfaced in the community deliberations. (A final report on the youth forum is available from CCIC and is posted on CCIC's website.)

The three choices in the youth forum deliberation guide dealt with responses to the changing employment prospects being brought about by globalization. The first choice, "Good jobs, good working conditions," focused on the importance of maintaining high labour standards and ensuring that all who want to work can do so for reasonable pay and under reasonable conditions. The second choice, "Strengthen competitive advantage" emphasized the importance

of following economic policies that will attract and keep high-knowledge employers and employees in Canada. The third choice, "Focus on sustainability," put the priority on ensuring that Canada's economic and employment policies lead to environmental sustainability.

"Environment must be our top priority"

Participants in the youth forum often had sharply differing perspectives, but there was virtually unanimous agreement on the importance of environmental sustainability. This was the strongest common ground that emerged from the forum.

In part, the attention to environmental issues was a reflection of the fact that one of the choices in the deliberation guide dealt with sustainable development. But this alone does not explain the group's strong emphasis on the environment: people came into the forum with strong environmental concerns. In pre-forum questionnaires, there was virtually unanimous agreement with the statement that *"we should focus on ensuring that our economic system and livelihoods are environmentally sustainable."*⁽⁶⁾

When respondents were pushed to consider the economic tradeoffs that this would entail, support was weaker, although it did increase somewhat after the forum. The average response to the statement *"We should focus on developing a sustainable economy even if this means that large numbers of people may be out of a job and have to learn new skills"* was 0.52 pre-forum and 0.92 post-forum (where a score of 2 represents the maximum, "strongly agree" and 1 represents "somewhat agree.")

Youth forum participants were taken aback when the panel of Parliamentarians told them that the environment has basically fallen off the political agenda. In their final presentation to the CCIC AGM, the youth strongly urged that more attention be given to environmental issues.

Citizen participation: "How can the individual Canadian be heard?"

Another theme that came out very strongly in the youth forum, as it had in the community forums, was the importance of citizen participation. In their presentation to the CCIC AGM, the youth noted that relationships between governments and corporations seem to be getting stronger while relationships between governments and citizens, and between corporations and citizens, are being frayed or are already broken. They asked how these relationships could be repaired, and stressed that governments need to listen more to the voices of ordinary Canadians.

Concerns about poverty and equality of opportunity

Like participants in the community forums, the youth forum participants were concerned about the gap between the rich and the poor, and the impacts of globalization on opportunities for education and work. There was general concern that current models of economic growth and globalization benefit some much more than others.

Participants strongly agreed with the questionnaire statement that *"we should give priority to ensuring that all people who want to work have the chance to do so, under reasonable conditions"*

and for reasonable pay." ⁽⁷⁾ A number of participants expressed doubt that economic growth alone was sufficient to reduce poverty, although this was not common ground, and raised concerns about inequalities in opportunity within Canada and internationally.

Need for corporate responsibility

As in the community forums, the issue of corporate responsibility and accountability surfaced repeatedly at the youth forum. Participants were very concerned about whether Canadian companies working abroad were respecting labour and environmental standards, and generally believed that companies should be held accountable for their activities overseas. They challenged the idea that corporations should focus only on "the bottom line," particularly when current economic systems do not adequately account for environmental costs.

"I believe quite strongly that Canada must take a strategic position with regard to who sets the agenda: the government or the multinationals."

Comment from a youth forum participant

Importance of education

Education was another theme that arose at the youth forum as it had in the community forums. Participants in the youth forum agreed that Canadians need to learn about globalization and its impacts both through formal education and through public education campaigns.

Not surprisingly, the youth were also preoccupied with broader issues of access to post-secondary education. There was considerable support for free and equitable access to post-secondary education designed for the full enrichment of the individual—not just for job skills as defined by an unsustainable global economy.

"As citizens of earth, people need to be informed and educated, and to change what we know is morally wrong."

Comment from a youth forum participant

3. Where Do We Go From Here?

At the end of the youth and community forums, groups were asked to consider what actions were needed to build on their common ground. From the common ground and these "next steps" come the following recommendations.

Individual Action

Take personal responsibility. Many groups spoke of the need for individuals to take responsibility—to use natural resources responsibly/reduce consumption, to shop locally/support local businesses, to use individual "consumer power" and buy fair trade products, to support non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that are working to improve conditions in developing countries, to be responsible shareholders, to educate ourselves and our children about these issues. A Montréal youth forum participant noted that *"small daily actions that proclaim our values can change society, with perseverance."* Even groups that were cynical about the potential to build a fairer global economy still supported personal actions as a way of expressing one's values.

Educate and inform others. Many groups also mentioned the importance of educating others, including political representatives, about globalization. A group in Sherbrooke suggested a "fair globalization week" to inform the public about these issues. A number of groups in Québec noted the importance of working with the media, as well as the importance of increasing the "public space" available to discuss these issues. A Montréal youth forum noted the need to *"raise people's awareness so that they think of themselves as citizens and not just as consumers."*

Act locally. Many saw ways to translate global concerns into local action. One group mentioned the need to work on local problems of slum landlords and sweatshops in Canada, and others mentioned encouraging local investment by pension funds and credit unions. Some noted the need for communities facing similar challenges to cooperate and to form domestic and international linkages between themselves, and for people to *"work to strengthen an increasing scale of 'community'."* Other groups spoke of establishing cooperatives or consumer groups.

Get involved politically. Several groups mentioned the need for citizens to get more involved in the political process. One group said *"don't just engage your MP, become your MP!"* and urged people to fight harder to oppose social and environmental cuts, provincially and federally. Another mentioned writing to newspapers and politicians to express one's views. A Montréal youth forum spoke of the need to *"take back political power."*

Continue the deliberations (as some have already done in their schools and communities) and continue to think and act as global citizens.

Government Action

Provide more opportunities for meaningful citizen participation, such as deliberations. People responded positively to the opportunity that the deliberations gave them to exercise their role as citizens. Many groups noted the need for continued public dialogue and consultation and expressed interest in continuing to explore issues related to globalization through discussions and deliberations. They also stressed that governments need to listen to the findings of citizen consultations and deliberations, and not just shelve the results.

Improve education about globalization. Many groups expressed a desire for better public education about globalization. Young people were most likely to recommend including more information on globalization in the school curriculum.

Encourage corporate responsibility and provision of social and environmental information on products and companies. Related to the desire for more public education, many groups expressed a desire for some sort of label or other means which indicates labour conditions and environmental costs. As a group in Brandon said, "*Show the real costs, let the consumer decide.*"

Forgive the debts of the poorest countries. This was mentioned quite frequently. At least one group also suggested offering better access to the Canadian marketplace to developing countries.

Work for a fairer global economy. In the forums and in questionnaire responses, there was considerable support for Canada taking a leadership role in working for a fairer global economy and promoting better international enforcement of labour and environmental standards. Although there was some doubt and confusion about what a fairer economy would entail, there was support for greater international regulation of corporate activity.

Corporate Action

Improve corporate responsibility. Considerable concern was expressed in the deliberations about the responsibilities of corporations, particularly vis-à-vis their impacts on working conditions and environmental standards. In questionnaires, there was very strong agreement with the idea that Canadian companies operating in other countries should uphold international labour and environmental standards.

One group noted that corporations had the responsibility to "*trade fairly and work towards improving conditions when working with countries with a lower standard of living.*" Others spoke of boycotts and complaints to stores and manufacturers, or the use of "positive purchasing" to encourage companies to be responsible. One group noted the importance of working with unions and pension funds to encourage responsible investment.

Civil Society Action

Continue to push for change: for example, urge governments to show leadership on issues such as debt forgiveness and a fairer global economy, pressure corporations to be more socially responsible.

Provide opportunities for citizen participation, such as deliberations, in which citizens can practise being global citizens.

Offer more public education on issues related to globalization.

Dissemination and Follow-up Activities

In a number of communities, people who participated in the deliberations are continuing to discuss the issues and build on what they have learned. Youth forum participants are continuing the deliberation through a list-serve established by CCIC and moderated by one of the forum participants. CIS and MCIC hope to run projects that will deepen the deliberations in their communities, encouraging people to address the tradeoffs and consequences of their common ground. The Marquis Project has been working with youth in the Brandon area to apply deliberation to issues of interest to them, linking this to international issues. Some AQOCI members are also applying the deliberation process to other issues.

CCIC is disseminating the results of the pilot project widely to its members and other participants in the *in common* campaign, and to decision-makers. CCIC and local organizers are providing summaries of the findings to MPs and senators, and CCIC is presenting the findings to committees and organizations concerned with issues of globalization and public participation. In addition, CCIC is distributing information about the project through its own publications, the *in common* website and press releases.

"These concerns are important to me to be addressed and solutions implemented. There should be follow-ups on these forums and what has been done is important for the public to know."

Comment from a deliberation participant in St. Peter's, Cape Breton

III. Deliberation as a Tool for Public Engagement

The provision of input from citizens to policy-makers on the issue of globalization was one objective of the pilot project. A second goal of the project was to demonstrate the viability of deliberative dialogue as a means of engaging the Canadian public in global issues that have a policy impact.

Qualitative observations from regional organizers, moderators and participants indicated that Canadians were very able to successfully deliberate on the complex issue of globalization. Organizers reiterated how much many people had enjoyed the discussions, in many cases staying to talk after the formal deliberation had ended. The experience of the pilot project indicates that many people are hungry for dialogue, and appreciate the new public space opened up by deliberation.

"We need opportunities like this to sit and talk about issues and ideas. It hardly matters what issues and ideas."

A deliberation participant in Cape North, Cape Breton

1. Strengths of Deliberation

An evaluation of the pilot project by national and regional organizers identified a number of strengths of deliberation.

Diversity of perspectives. Deliberation encourages a variety of perspectives, and works best when such variety is present. For many people who are used to black-and-white, polarizing, "you're wrong and I'm right" debates, this is very refreshing. Comments from participants indicate that people appreciate having the space that deliberation provides for thinking, learning, changing one's mind, refining one's views and learning about the views of others.

Emphasis on experience. People do not have to be experts to participate, because at heart, deliberation is about values. Even people with little knowledge of globalization can understand the tradeoffs between supporting local businesses and shopping at cheaper big-box stores, and have strong feelings on human rights and environmental issues. Experts and activists sometimes become frustrated with the level of discussion but, if they listen and participate, can gain valuable insights into the values and motivations of the people they are seeking to engage. One participant in Sydney noted that it was *"good to have an opportunity to discuss the issue with other people. It's something I think about a lot, but don't usually have a chance to discuss."*

Issue framing and guide. Framing a difficult issue into three or more choices provides a context in which people can explore different points of view without falling into time-worn "right-left" or other black and white positions. Good issue framing can also help people make the connections between local and global issues, and look at local issues with fresh eyes. Although some people did not like the structured aspect of a deliberation, most were willing to go along with it, and the structure helped bring out ideas and opinions that otherwise would not have surfaced.

In general, organizers, participants and moderators found the issue guide to be a balanced and useful tool. Some felt it was a bit too detailed, some felt it was not detailed enough, but most thought it provided a good level of information and context. Some felt it focused too much on the economic aspects of globalization as opposed to social and cultural aspects; this had been a deliberate choice during the issue framing in order to keep the issue to a "manageable" size for effective deliberation.

Enjoyable and needed public space for dialogue. The experience of the pilot project indicates that many people are hungry for dialogue, and appreciate the new public space opened up by deliberation. Many people appreciated the fact that the deliberations gave them a chance to discuss issues with fellow citizens from a variety of backgrounds, some of whom they would not normally encounter.

Safety of discussion. Because of the non-confrontational structure and professional moderation of the deliberation, people generally felt free to express their opinions, even when they knew others would disagree. An organizer noted that *"people feel free to say what they think without fear of attack. Opposing views can be heard with more light than heat."*

For many, and especially for quieter people, this was a welcome experience. As a participant in Winnipeg noted, *"the politeness and openness is very useful for education and consideration of the issues."* Another noted that it was *"good to hear everyone's point of view in this format without confrontation."*

"This really opened my eyes to the issues. A lot of this information isn't well known and should be. I learned a lot from the older members of the group and enjoyed the different viewpoints."

Comment from a high school student who participated in a deliberation in Sydney.

No action necessary. Activists occasionally became frustrated with the process, but the fact that no action was required after the deliberation was a selling point for many participants. Those who are already involved in volunteer activities are often wary of becoming more involved, while those who have not been involved in international development activities are leery of a "sales pitch." One organizer noted that people are more likely to take action afterward *because* there is no obligation to do so.

A survey of participants three months after the deliberations revealed that about 18 percent had taken some action directly related to what had been deliberated. (These were actions that the respondents indicated they would not otherwise have taken.) Usually, these actions related to consumer decisions such as buying locally, buying a fair trade product or showing more concern for the origins of a product. As a public engagement tool, deliberation offers a way for people to think about and reflect collectively on an issue without scaring them off, and provides a potential jumping-off point for further action.

In the survey three months after the forums, respondents were asked what they now considered to be the most important issue or problem associated with globalization. The issues mentioned most frequently were the need to strengthen local communities and work at a local level, and the impact of globalization on poverty and the growing gap between the rich and the poor. Other issues mentioned were education, environment and financial speculation. The responses suggest a continuing preoccupation among deliberation participants with issues of community, fairness and poverty.

Questioning of presently-held views/changing people's views of other people's views. By causing people to rethink their views of others, and of others' views—as discussed in "Shifting Opinions, Core Values" in the previous section—deliberation opens up new opportunities for dialogue between people who may have stopped listening and talking to each other. The West Manitoba organizer noted that *"some have suggested that it has improved the capacity for productive discussion in struggling communities."*

Opportunity for reaching new people. Because deliberation provides a way to break out of stereotypical roles and views, it offers an opportunity to engage people who have not previously been interested in international development issues. A participant in Mabou, Cape Breton commented that *"I really enjoyed it. I never really understood globalization until now. It caused me to be more aware of how globalization affects us as a community."* One organizer noted that

"the public space created for diversity is a welcome change from 'preaching to the converted' kind of meetings."

Renewal of interest/activism. In comments and follow-up interviews, a number of people already active in international development organizations noted that the deliberations had helped to "recharge their batteries" and stimulated their activism. A participant at one of the Montréal youth forums noted that it was *"stimulating to know that there are others who are working to obtain the same objectives."*

National initiative. In some regions at least, the fact that this pilot project was a national initiative was a strength. There is benefit in linking activities across the country so that they become part of a larger movement with greater impact and momentum. The project also provided a concrete opportunity for groups to work together as a sector. A national organization like CCIC can provide research and training support, compile and analyze results, disseminate these to decision-makers and offer an ongoing network to share and facilitate learnings from the deliberation process. Local/regional groups can involve their communities, link the deliberation to local issues, experiment with the hands-on application of deliberation, and involve local media and politicians.

"It is amazing to see how much you don't know about what is happening in the world around you, even in your own community and/or country. It is a very good environment to sit and discuss. An opportunity is given to delve deeper into the issues."

Comment from a Winnipeg forum participant

"It was 'invigorating' to find so many well-versed people attending this evening's discussion. I feel so much the richer for the experience."

Comment from a deliberation participant in Sydney

"We do need to keep the dialogue going at all levels. Grassroots can (and must) have the opportunity to effect change...Broadened my horizons, generated thoughts and insights. Promoted a greater sense of being a citizen in this global community. Thank you for the opportunity to participate."

Comment from a participant at a Winnipeg forum

2. Weaknesses of Deliberation

The pilot project also revealed some weaknesses of deliberation as a method of public engagement.

Lack of time to address hard choices and trade-offs. An important purpose of deliberation is to push people to think through the consequences of their choices. However, it became clear that, for a complex issue like globalization, a three-hour session does not provide enough time to do this thoroughly. In some cases, observers had the impression that groups were coming up with

"common ground" at the end because this was a step in the process that had to be done, not because they had truly achieved common ground.

For issues where groups did deliberate tradeoffs more deeply (such as the issue of "buying locally"), questionnaire results showed a greater net shift in opinion, suggesting that when people have enough time to address trade-offs in depth, deliberation can affect and advance their thinking. In the youth forum, when there was more time to push the tradeoffs and consequences, there was less common ground than in many of the community forums, but the common ground that was achieved was more solid. A similar phenomenon was observed in the Winnipeg study circle — there was less common ground, but the common ground that was achieved was more deeply considered because there had been more time to delve into consequences and tradeoffs.

At the same time, it is difficult enough to get people to come to one deliberation, and it would be even more difficult to get people who were not already interested in the issues to commit to study circles. This suggests that it may be necessary to hold "standard" deliberations first in order to get people interested, and then try to involve them in deeper consideration of the issues and tradeoffs. Several of the pilot regions plan to organize a round of follow-up deliberations in some of the original deliberation communities this fall, in order to delve more deeply into the issues.

Level of research and other support required. Development of a good deliberation guide requires considerable research and work on issue framing. If the results of the deliberations are to contribute in a useful way to the policy process, they must be compiled, analyzed and disseminated to decision-makers. NGOs must have sufficient research and analysis capability to undertake successful deliberations that include these components.

The regional organizers were not in favour of CCIC preparing a "how-to" manual, because they felt that it is not possible to learn how to coordinate and moderate an effective deliberation process by reading a manual. Hands-on training and access to advice and mentoring from more experienced people are essential to ensure implementation of effective deliberations.

Verbal, intellectual nature of the process. The deliberation process works best for people who are comfortable with verbal expression and with reading a deliberation guide. A participant in Deloraine commented that "*there were too many words in the booklet received at the start.*" The challenge is to involve those who are less comfortable with a highly verbal process, and to present issues simply without being simplistic. It is more challenging to do this when dealing with international development issues than when deliberating local issues, which a range of people are more likely to have heard about and understand. This is an area that requires further work.

3. Outstanding Issues

Connection to action/to groups working on these issues. Although for many, the fact that deliberation doesn't have to lead to action is a strength, others will emerge from a deliberation interested and inspired to do more. Post-forum surveys show that some will take action on their own, but there is a question of whether others might have acted but lost interest because there

were no readily available means to take action. The whole question of where deliberation fits in the continuum of public engagement needs more exploration—for example, would it be beneficial to link deliberations more directly to action campaigns, or would that reduce the openness of the process and its ability to attract people from a diversity of viewpoints? This is something that should be tested in future projects.

There are many ways that individuals might choose to take action on what they learned or experienced in a deliberation, and not all will be compatible with sponsoring organization approaches (if any). One logical follow-up to a deliberation, which does not presuppose any particular point of view on the part of participants, might be a study circle in which they could explore the issues in more depth.

Application of findings. The deliberation project was successful in demonstrating the viability of deliberation as a means of public engagement, and in providing input to decision-makers. However, the extent to which this input will be used by, or useful to, policy-makers is still unknown. Probably this is a long-term goal, as policy-makers become more open to listening to this type of considered public judgment and as those running deliberations become more practiced at moving deliberation through to trade-offs (e.g., through study circles), at choosing and framing issues and at developing data-gathering instruments.

4. Conditions for Success

Based on the experience of the pilot project, efforts to engage the public through deliberation are likely to be more successful if the following factors are in place.

A multisectoral planning group: In general, the regions which had planning groups with representatives from a variety of domestic and international organizations found them to be very useful as sounding boards and as sources of contacts and referrals. Their expanded networks helped organizers bring together more diverse groups for the deliberations, and the involvement of people from various sectors underscored that the deliberations were a "neutral" activity, not sessions in which a particular perspective would be pushed. However, depending on time constraints, it may not always be possible to pull together an effective planning group.

Sufficient resources and strong coordination: Organizers agreed that the financial, informational and organizational support received from CCIC were primary conditions for success. The role of coordinator is demanding and time-consuming—in all the pilot areas, contract staff were hired to do the coordination. The fact that organizers could pay an honorarium to moderators helped in attracting good moderators. The experience of the pilot project suggests that it would be difficult for a regional group to organize a first round of deliberations without assistance.

Good issue framing and materials: A well-researched and balanced issue guide is essential. It can be very demanding to frame an issue in a way that corresponds to the way non-experts view the issue. Initial selection of the issue itself can be demanding—not all issues are suitable for

deliberation. Deliberation works best for issues with a strong values component, issues which are sufficiently broad that people from different walks of life can see the connections to their experience. Often, it takes several tries to identify an issue for framing. Extensive research, interviews, drafting and reviewing of materials and focus-group testing of materials are then necessary to frame a complex issue. It would be difficult for individual organizations to do this without external funding.

Well-trained moderators and recorders: The role of the moderator is crucial to a successful deliberation and to the validity of data collected. The moderator must be able to put participants at ease, present the issue clearly and neutrally, tactfully keep the talkers from dominating the discussion and encourage quiet people, ensure that opposing points of view are brought out, bring out discussion of values and push trade-offs, work with the recorder to reliably summarize the common ground from the group in a feedback form, and ensure that participants complete their pre- and post-forum questionnaires.

In short, it's not an easy job moderating a deliberation, and proper training is essential. Even with the benefit of two days of professional training, and even though many of the moderators were already experienced facilitators, many found moderation a bit intimidating and challenging,. Those who moderated more than one session showed improvement, according to observers and their own comments.

The role of the recorder also needs attention. The recorders in the pilot project had attended the moderator training, but some found it difficult to synthesize threads of common ground and had a tendency to "report back" everything that was said in a deliberation. Additional training for recorders would help people learn to listen for common ground.

Diversity of opinion and experience: The greatest challenge that regional organizers encountered in the pilot project was convincing people from a variety of viewpoints to participate in the deliberations. Given the nature of the sponsoring organizations and the topic, it was easier to attract the "natural constituency" of the *in common* campaign (i.e., those already concerned about issues of poverty and social justice). But the pilot project confirmed that deliberation does not achieve its potential unless there is sufficient diversity of opinion.

If a group is too homogeneous, a good moderator can bring out opposing points of view and the group can have a very good discussion, but without participants who have genuinely different values and viewpoints, it is difficult to get the tension and frank exchange that characterizes a good deliberation. Attracting diverse people to a deliberation is a constant challenge for organizers, but it is one of the most important considerations in success. For example, in the pilot, considerable work was done to attract the high ratio of participants who identified themselves as coming from the private sector. This was an important ingredient in achieving the overall diversity of opinion that was needed. This is why it is so useful to have a multisectoral planning group.

The size of the group is also a factor. Deliberation works best when there are about 12-18 people present. With too few, there is likely to be insufficient diversity of opinion. With too many, it is difficult for everyone to contribute.

In general, the pilot deliberations showed that youth bring an energy, idealism and directness to the discussion that is very beneficial. The youth forums in communities worked very well, but coordinators believe it is also important to encourage intergenerational exchange in deliberations that involve people from a range of ages. To a certain extent, the National Youth Forum built on the intergenerational community discussions by giving youth a chance to come together to further the deliberation after they had participated in a community forum. Another approach might be to hold community youth forums first, to attract youth to the issue, and then invite those youth to intergenerational forums. In a new project, The Marquis Project is working with youth even earlier, in framing the issues for deliberation.

"I am a high school student and found myself benefiting greatly from having the opinions of those not in my generation...I would like to say that the format of the evening was highly enjoyable. The chance to freely express my opinions with people I wouldn't normally interact with was quite enlightening."
Comment from a participant at the Sydney deliberation

5. Next Steps

The pilot project confirmed that Canadians can deliberate effectively about international policy issues, and that deliberation shows considerable potential as a tool for public engagement. As a collaborative effort between a number of NGOs, the project was also effective in developing linkages and capacity in the sector.

However, the pilot project represented only the tip of the iceberg in terms of the potential application of deliberation in the area of global issues, and as a vehicle for people to practise being global citizens. Subject to the availability of funding, CCIC hopes to extend the deliberations to other regions and build on the experience of the pilot project. It will be particularly important to try to achieve the diversity of opinion that is critical to effective deliberation. This may require a longer time period for the deliberations, to enable local organizers to make the multisectoral contacts necessary to draw in people from all points of view. Another priority will be to experiment with ways to present issues using more accessible, visual and less reading-based methods.

A number of spinoffs from the deliberation pilot project have already occurred. In Port Hawkesbury, Cape Breton, high school students who attended the community deliberation invited a local moderator to provide information on globalization to their class, and then they themselves ran a deliberation in the class on the following day. Two Cape Breton moderators went to Halifax at the invitation of Oxfam, and moderated a deliberation for youth using the globalization issue guide. One of the participants, who subsequently attended the National Youth Forum in Ottawa, will be organizing globalization forums in rural schools in Nova Scotia as part of a global education series organized by several NGOs.

People in several communities indicated an intention to continue the dialogue, and

many people asked for extra copies of the deliberation guide to pass along to their church groups, social organizations and schools. CIS and MCIC hope to organize more deliberations on globalization to try to deal more directly with values and tradeoffs. By partnering with other organizations, CIS hopes to also broaden the deliberations to other parts of Atlantic Canada.

With public engagement funding from CIDA, the Marquis Project has been working with local high schools and youth organizations in the Brandon area to involve youth in framing issues of concern to them, and then organize multigenerational deliberations. In Sherbrooke, Carrefour de Solidarité Internationale hopes to use the deliberation technique to facilitate discussion among its membership. Individual moderators have also indicated an interest in using the globalization deliberation materials in public outreach work.

The Kettering Institute in the United States has used the globalization guide in a deliberation session involving participants from a variety of countries. It was well-received, and a number thought it could be used, with minor adaptations, in deliberations in their own countries .

Involvement of local organizations is essential for effective on-the-ground coordination. However, given the financial constraints most regional and local NGOs face, it will be difficult to involve new groups without a certain level of start-up funding. In the longer term, CCIC will be focusing on building a financially sustainable deliberation effort. This will include experimenting with local groups accessing funds as well as exploring options for grants and revenue generation at the national level. CCIC will also continue to provide training to its member organizations and other groups interested in deliberation.

Promising areas for further study and experimentation include working with formats such as study circles that allow for more in-depth reflection and a more thorough deliberation of trade-offs (as Manitoba and Cape Breton hope to do). This may involve supplemental training from CCIC. More attention will also be given to ways to make the links between deliberation and action, without compromising the diversity of opinion so crucial for effective deliberation.

Other promising areas for deliberation include exploring its use with youth (as The Marquis Project is doing); linking communities from different parts of the world in a deliberation of common issues; and using deliberation on global issues as a way to begin community problem-solving on the local implications.

For the *in common* campaign, the deliberation findings provide lessons regarding the need to further clarify the vision of a more equitable economic order. Although Canadians are attracted to the idea of a fairer global economy, they are pragmatic, and sometimes skeptical, about whether it is possible. People need more evidence that a fairer global economy is possible, and more specific information about how it can be achieved.

CCIC and *in common* will continue to monitor the interest of decision-makers in the results of citizen engagement initiatives such as deliberation. CCIC will continue to work with other

groups that are exploring various forms of public engagement and the ways government can incorporate the results of these into decision-making.

Endnotes

(1) Quotes from groups are taken from moderators' reports of the common ground that the groups agreed to. Quotes from individuals were drawn from observation of the sessions and from participant questionnaires.

(2) Before the forum, only 2 percent of young people strongly agreed, 27 percent somewhat agreed with the statement; after the forum, 11 percent strongly agreed and 37 percent somewhat agreed

(3) Post-forum, 36 percent of women strongly or somewhat agreed with the statement, as compared with 59 percent of men.

(4) 35 percent strongly disagreed and 9 percent somewhat disagreed

(5) 52 percent of women versus 33 percent of men strongly disagreed; 5 percent of women versus 19 percent of men somewhat disagreed. 52 percent of youth strongly disagreed and 23 percent somewhat disagreed. 41 percent of those over 28 years of age strongly disagreed, while 22 percent somewhat disagreed.

(6) For this question, 2 represented "strongly agree" and 1 represented "somewhat agree." The average response was 1.96, both pre- and post-forum.

(7) Average post-forum response of 1.88 out of possible maximum of 2 ("strongly agree").

Other Publications:

The executive summary on the deliberation pilot project report is available from CCIC and is posted on CCIC's website. The following publications related to deliberation are also available from CCIC and are posted on the website.

Deliberation Guides

A World in Common: Talking about what matters in a borderless world. March 1999.

A World in Common—Globalization and the Future of Work: What path should we take?
National Youth Forum deliberation guide. May 1999.

Poverty and Inequity: A global challenge. 1998.

Moderator Guides

Moderator's Guide to A World in Common: Talking about what matters in a borderless world. March 1999.

Moderator's Guide to Poverty and Inequity: A global challenge. 1998.

Reports

"Environment must be our top priority." Final Report: National Youth Forum. September 1999.

What We Can Do: A 10-Point Agenda for Global Action Against Poverty. in common/CCIC. 1998.

Newsletters

A World in Common: Talking about what matters in a borderless world. Participant newsletters: 3 issues (April, June and October 1999).